

## REMARKS

The Examiner has objected to claims. Such objections are deemed overcome in view of the clarifications made hereinabove to the claims.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 1-6, 8-9, 11-12, and 15-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Saylor et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,501,832). Applicant respectfully disagrees with such rejection, especially in view of the amendments made hereinabove to each of the independent claims. Specifically, applicant has amended each of the independent claims to include the subject matter of Claims 2-3 and 9, as well as additional limitations believed to be novel when taken in combination with the remaining claim limitations.

With respect to each of the independent Claims, applicant respectfully asserts that simply nowhere in Saylor is there any suggestion of “receiving input associated with an entity from the user; performing a query to identify a plurality of locations of the entity; ascertaining which of the identified locations of the entity are in proximity to the location associated with the user; wherein the user is informed about the locations of the entity ascertained to be in proximity to the location associated with the user; wherein the user is informed audibly via a speech recognition portal about the locations of the entity ascertained to be in proximity to the location of the user” (See Claims 1, 15 and 18).

Saylor discloses that “[t]he menu of options may include...the geographical location of the Monument...restaurants located near the Washington Monument...” (see Col. 9 lines 1-9). Further, Saylor teaches that such options are available when “[a] tourist in Washington D.C. visits the Washington Monument” (see Col. 8 lines 55-56). Saylor’s above quoted teachings simply fail to meet applicant’s claims. Specifically, applicant claims “identifying a plurality of locations of the entity,” and not simply the geographical location of the place the user is visiting as described in Saylor.

Also, Saylor's "menu of options" includes "options about or relating to the Washington Monument", or more generally the place the user is visiting (see Col. 9, lines 1-10). This is not the same as applicant's claimed "ascertaining which of the identified locations of the entity are in proximity to the location associated with the user." Applicant emphasizes that locations of the entity that are in proximity to the user's location is simply not even suggested by Saylor's menu of options about or relating to a place, and especially since Saylor's disclosed options include *other* locations relating to the specified place (e.g. weather, restaurants, bus routes, etc), and not locations of the entity itself.

The Examiner is reminded that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Moreover, the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.* 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim.

This criterion has simply not been met by the Saylor reference, especially in view of the amendments made hereinabove. A notice of allowance or a specific prior art showing of all of applicant's claim limitations, in combination with the remaining claim elements, is respectfully requested.

It is further noted that the Examiner's rejection of applicant's dependent claims is further replete with deficiencies. Specifically, with respect to most of the dependent claims, the Examiner has simply dismissed the same under Official Notice. In response, applicant thus formally requests a specific showing of the subject matter in ALL of the claims in any future action. Note excerpt from MPEP below.

"If the applicant traverses such an [Official Notice] assertion the examiner should cite a reference in support of his or her position." See MPEP 2144.03.

A notice of allowance or a specific prior art showing of all of applicant's claim limitations, in combination with the remaining claim elements, is respectfully requested.

Still yet, applicant brings the following subject matter of new Claims 21-29 to the Examiner's attention, for full consideration:

21. (New) The method as recited in claim 1, wherein an origin address is determined utilizing at least one of speech recognition and a global positioning system.
22. (New) The method as recited in claim 1, wherein the speech recognition portal utilizes a network.
23. (New) The method as recited in claim 1, wherein the entity is a destination name.
24. (New) The method as recited in claim 23, wherein the destination name includes a category.
25. (New) The method as recited in claim 23, wherein the destination name includes a brand name.
26. (New) The method as recited in claim 23, wherein a destination address is identified based on the destination name utilizing a database that includes addresses associated with at least one of business names, brand names, and goods and services.
27. (New) The method as recited in claim 26, wherein the database includes a categorization of the destination names.

28. (New) The method as recited in claim 1, further comprising receiving an utterance representative of the entity from the user.

29. (New) The method as recited in claim 28, further comprising recognizing the entity associated with the utterance using a speech recognition process.

A notice of allowance or a specific prior art showing of each of the foregoing claim limitations, in combination with the remaining claim elements, is respectfully requested.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 505-5100. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be due or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. BVOC020).

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin J. Zilka  
Registration No. 41,429

P.O. Box 721120  
San Jose, CA 95172-1120  
408-505-5100